

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-56 are canceled. Claim 57 is newly presented for consideration.

Claim 57 recites “displaying an outline in a corner on each of a plurality of slides of a presentation created by a presentation program.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 1.

Claim 57 recites “separating the outline from the remainder of each of the plurality of slides by a user configurable line.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 1.

Claim 57 recites “wherein the outline is created from a title of each of the slides in the presentation.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 1.

Claim 57 recites “responsive to a user selecting to expand all levels of topics of the presentation, displaying the outline expanded to all levels on each slide.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 6 and Specification [0053].

Claim 57 recites “responsive to a user selecting to expand a user-configurable number of levels of the outline, displaying the outline expanded to the user-configurable number of levels on each slide.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 7 and Specification [0053].

Claim 57 recites “responsive to a user selecting to expand only a current topic of the presentation on the outline, displaying the outline expanded to only the current topic of the presentation on each slide.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 8 and Specification [0053].

Claim 57 recites “responsive to a user limiting the number of lines on the outline, displaying the limited number of lines on the outline.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 9.

Claim 57 recites “wherein immediately adjacent topics are displayed in any remaining lines.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 10.

Claim 57 recites “wherein the topics above the current topic are displayed, subject to the user limited number of lines, and then the immediately adjacent topics are displayed, subject to the user limited number of lines.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 11.

Claim 57 recites “responsive to a user limiting the topics on the outline, displaying only desired outline topics that are not limited by the user.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 12 and Specification [0055].

Claim 57 recites “responsive to a user selection to display the topics after the current topic, not displaying previous topics on the outline.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 13 and Specification [0055].

Claim 57 recites “responsive to a user selection to display the topics before the current topic, not displaying subsequent topics on the outline.” Support for this subject matter may be found at least at prior claim 14 and Specification [0055].

No new matter is entered.

Issues

Claims 1-5, 8-26, 29-43, and 46-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0033296 A1 (herein Fullerton) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0122863 A1 (herein Dieberger), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0109712 A1 (herein Yacovone), and screen shots of Microsoft PowerPoint (fourteen pages/figures, first referenced in the Office Action dated Nov. 13, 2007) (herein PowerPoint Screen Shots). Final Office Action, pp. 2-16.

Claims 6, 27, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0033296 A1 (herein Fullerton) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0122863 A1 (herein Dieberger), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0109712 A1 (herein Yacovone), screen shots of Microsoft PowerPoint (fourteen pages/figures, first referenced in the Office Action dated Nov. 13, 2007) (herein PowerPoint Screen Shots), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0218639 A1 (herein Lee). Final Office Action, pp. 16-18.

Claims 7, 28, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0033296 A1 (herein Fullerton) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0122863 A1 (herein Dieberger), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0109712 A1 (herein Yacovone), screen shots of Microsoft PowerPoint (fourteen pages/figures, first referenced in the Office Action dated Nov. 13, 2007) (herein PowerPoint Screen Shots), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0076312 A1 (herein Gardner). Final Office Action, pp. 18-20. Applicant notes that while the Final Office Action cites to U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0138570 A1 (herein Good), the quotations relied upon by the Examiner are found in Gardner. Hence, Applicant treats the ground of rejection as being over Fullerton in view of Dieberger, Yacovone, PowerPoint Screen Shots, and Gardner.

First Ground of Rejection

Claims 1-5, 8-26, 29-43, and 46-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0033296 A1 (herein Fullerton) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0122863 A1 (herein Dieberger), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0109712 A1 (herein Yacovone), and screen shots of Microsoft PowerPoint (fourteen pages/figures,

first referenced in the Office Action dated Nov. 13, 2007) (herein PowerPoint Screen Shots). Final Office Action pp. 2-16.

Claims 1-5, 8-26, 29-43, and 46-56 are canceled. Therefore, the ground rejection is moot. Applicant discusses the patentability of claim 57 in light of this ground of rejection below.

Second Ground of Rejection

Claims 6, 27, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0033296 A1 (herein Fullerton) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0122863 A1 (herein Dieberger), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0109712 A1 (herein Yacovone), screen shots of Microsoft PowerPoint (fourteen pages/figures, first referenced in the Office Action dated Nov. 13, 2007) (herein PowerPoint Screen Shots), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0218639 A1 (herein Lee). Final Office Action pp. 16-18.

Claims 6, 27, and 44 are canceled. Therefore, the ground rejection is moot. Applicant discusses the patentability of claim 57 in light of this ground of rejection below.

Third Ground of Rejection

Claims 7, 28, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0033296 A1 (herein Fullerton) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0122863 A1 (herein Dieberger), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0109712 A1 (herein Yacovone), screen shots of Microsoft PowerPoint (fourteen pages/figures, first referenced in the Office Action dated Nov. 13, 2007) (herein PowerPoint Screen Shots), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0076312 A1 (herein Gardner). Final Office Action pp. 18-20. Applicant notes that while the Final Office Action cites to U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0138570 A1 (herein Good), the quotations relied upon by the Examiner are found in Gardner. Hence, Applicant treats the ground of rejection as being over Fullerton in view of Dieberger, Yacovone, PowerPoint Screen Shots, and Gardner.

Claims 7, 28, and 45 are canceled. Therefore, the ground rejection is moot. Applicant discusses the patentability of claim 57 in light of this ground of rejection below.

Patentability of Claim 57

Claim 57 recites “displaying an outline in a corner on each of a plurality of slides of a presentation created by a presentation program.” The Examiner alleges Fullerton teaches “displaying an outline” (Final Office Action p.3 (citing to Fullerton [0014])), and that Dieberger teaches “in a corner on each of a plurality of slides” (Final Office Action p.4 (citing to Dieberger FIG. 1 and [0020]-[0021] and

[0036])). The Examiner states for motivation to combine that the modification “would provide more viewing space for the presentation content, and easily display the contextual information in a non-intrusive manner (e.g. in paragraph 21 and 25 of page 2).”

If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s reasoning because displaying an outline on the slides of Fullerton would be duplicative and render Fullerton’s outline window unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

The combination proposed by the Examiner would place an outline onto the slides displayed in Fullerton’s main window 232, but Fullerton already displays an outline in outline window 238. As such, the combination would needlessly duplicate the outline information, displaying them both on the slides of main window 232 and on outline window 238. With such duplication of information, Fullerton’s outline window becomes unsatisfactory for its primary purpose of displaying outline information because it would then be merely be duplicating information already found on the slide, per the proposed combination. As such, duplicating the outline information renders Fullerton’s outline window 238 unsatisfactory for its primary purpose. Hence, there is not sufficient motivation for the proposed combination.

Claim 57 also recites “wherein the outline is created from a title of each of the slides in the presentation” and the outline is displayed “on each of a plurality of slides.” The Examiner admits Fullerton fails to meet these limitations (Final Office Action p.4) and alleges Yacovone remedies Fullerton’s deficiency (Final Office Action p.5 (citing to Yacovone [0041])).

The combination fails to meet an outline displayed “on each of a plurality of slides,” the outline “created from a title of each of the slides” at least because the cited portions of Yacovone are silent to these limitations. While Yacovone teaches “storing each slide title in a database for use later ... in the form of an active table-of-contents,” the cited portions of Yacovone are silent as to displaying its active table-of-contents on each slide. The cited portions of Dieberger are not relied upon and do not remedy this deficiency. Hence, the claim’s limitations of “wherein the outline is created from a title of each of the slides in the presentation” are outside the scope of the cited art.

Claim 57 also recites “responsive to a user selecting to expand all levels of topics of the presentation, displaying the outline expanded to all levels on each slide.” The Examiner alleges Lee teaches “expanded to all levels.” Final Office Action p.16 (rejecting similar limitations from claim 6).

The combination of cited art fails to teach “displaying the outline expanded to all levels on each slide” at least because the cited portions of Lee are silent to these limitations. While Lee teaches an “expand all” option, the cited portions of Lee are silent to this option being applied to an outline displayed on each slide of a presentation. The cited portions of Fullerton, Dieberger, Yacovone, and the PowerPoint Screen Shots are not relied upon and do not remedy these deficiencies. Hence, the claim’s limitations of “responsive to a user selecting to expand all levels of topics of the presentation, displaying the outline expanded to all levels on each slide” are outside the scope of the combination of cited art.

Claim 57 also recites “responsive to a user selecting to expand a user-configurable number of levels of the outline, displaying the outline expanded to the user-configurable number of levels on each slide.” The Examiner alleges Gardner teaches “to expand a user-configurable number of levels.” Final Office Action pp. 18-19 (rejecting similar limitations from claim 7).

The combination of cited art fails to teach “displaying the outline expanded to the user-configurable number of levels on each slide. While Gardner teaches an “open up to level” option, the cited portions of Gardner are silent to this option being applied to an outline displayed on each slide of a presentation. The cited portions of Fullerton, Dieberger, Yacovone, and the PowerPoint Screen Shots are not relied upon and do not remedy these deficiencies. Hence, the claim’s limitations of “responsive to a user selecting to expand all levels of topics of the presentation, displaying the outline expanded to all levels on each slide” are outside the scope of the combination of cited art.

Claim 57 also recites “responsive to a user selecting to expand only a current topic of the presentation on the outline, displaying the outline expanded to only the current topic of the presentation on each slide.” The Examiner alleges Fullerton teaches these limitations. Final Office Action p.8 (rejecting similar limitations from claim 8 and citing to Fullerton [0012] and [0253]).

The combination fails to teach “displaying the outline expanded to only the current topic of the presentation on each slide” at least because the cited portions of Fullerton are silent to “displaying the outline ... on each slide.” Even if Fullerton taught “to expand only a current topic,” the cited portions of Fullerton are silent to displaying an outline expanded to only a current topic on each slide of a presentation. The cited portions of Dieberger, Yacovone, and the PowerPoint Screen Shots are not relied upon and do not remedy these deficiencies. Hence, the claim’s limitations of “displaying the outline expanded to only the current topic of the presentation on each slide” are outside the scope of the combination of cited art.

Claim 57 also recites “responsive to a user limiting the number of lines on the outline, displaying the limited number of lines on the outline,” wherein the outline is displayed on each of a plurality of slides of a presentation. The Examiner alleges Fullerton’s resizable outline window meets these limitations. Final Office Action pp. 8-9. The Examiner reasons that changing the size of a box allows the user to display more, less, or keep the same number of lines of the outline. Final Office Action p.23.

The combination of cited fails to teach “responsive to a user limiting the number of lines on the outline, displaying the limited number of lines on the outline,” wherein the outline is displayed on each of a plurality of slides of a presentation, because resizing a box does not display a limited number of lines on an outline on each slide of a presentation. For example, a user may resize a box so that two lines of text are displayed and then reduce the font size of the text in the box by half so that four lines would then be displayed. As such, since the user did not limit the number of lines displayed by the box and instead merely changed the size of the box, the number of lines displayed in the box changed. Hence, merely resizing a box does not inherently disclose limiting the number of lines displayed by the box. Stated another way, while resizing a box may limit the display area of a box, resizing a box does not limit the number of lines displayed by the box.

Claim 57 also recites “responsive to a user selection to display the topics after the current topic, not displaying previous topics on the outline.” The Examiner alleges Fullerton’s expandable elements in outline Fullerton’s window 238 meets these limitations. Final Office Action pp. 10-11 (rejecting similar features from claim 13).

The combination of cited art fails to teach “responsive to a user selection to display the topics after the current topic, not displaying previous topics on the outline” at least because the cited portions of Fullerton are silent to “not displaying previous topics on the outline.” While a user may expand or collapse the elements within Fullerton’s outline window 238, such expanding or collapsing still allows for display of previous topics. For example, if a user is at the first “What is Discourse” topic and collapsed the “Welcome” topic (thereby hiding the “Discourse” and “Brief Intro to the Interface” topics), the “Welcome” topic would still be displayed even though the “Welcome” topic is a previous topic (with regard to the “What is Discourse?” topic). The cited portions of Dieberger, Yacovone, and the PowerPoint Screen Shots are not relied upon and do not remedy these deficiencies. Hence, the claim’s limitations of “not displaying previous topics on the outline” are outside the scope of the combination of cited art.

Claim 57 also recites “responsive to a user selection to display the topics before the current topic, not displaying subsequent topics on the outline.” The Examiner alleges Fullerton’s expandable elements

in outline Fullerton's window 238 meets these limitations. Final Office Action pp. 11 (rejecting similar features from claim 14).

The combination of cited art fails to teach "responsive to a user selection to display the topics before the current topic, not displaying subsequent topics on the outline" at least because the cited portions of Fullerton are silent to "not displaying subsequent topics on the outline." While a user may expand or collapse the elements within Fullerton's outline window 238, such expanding or collapsing still allows for display of subsequent topics. For example, if a user is at the "Welcome" topic and collapsed the first "What is Discourse?" topic (thereby hiding all the topics below the first "What is Discourse?" topic), the first "What is Discourse?" topic itself would still be displayed even though it is a subsequent topic to the "Welcome" topic. The cited portions of Dieberger, Yacovone, and the PowerPoint Screen Shots are not relied upon and do not remedy these deficiencies. Hence, the claim's limitations of "not displaying subsequent topics on the outline" are outside the scope of the combination of cited art.

Thus, claim 57 comprises features and limitations that are outside the scope of the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests an indication of allowability.

Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over Fullerton et al, Dieberger et al., Yacovone et al., Lee et al. and Good et al. and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: August 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Reg. No. 37,720
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants